July 29, 1959 OFFICE MEMORANDUM To: Norman Smith From: Henry Anderson Last night (July 28, 1959), I attended a meeting of the San Joaquin County Tomato Growers Association, Northern Section, at 141 S. American Street, Stockton. I was not challenged at any time during the proceedings, nor asked to identify myself. To the best of my ability to recall, the following things were said and done in the course of the meeting. 1. Ray Roth, Regional Supervisor for the Farm Placement Service, addressed the group concerning labor prospects in the forthcoming tomato harfest. "We have no reason to believe there will be any more domestics available than we have had in the past," he said. "We have every reason to believe we will have to use about the same number of Nationals that we have used for the past several years." Mr. Roth quoted several of the Farm Placement Service's "17 points." He attributed these points to Mr. John Carr, and made no mention of Mr. Carr's previous lopoint policy directive. Mr. Roth laid heavy stress upon the Farm Placement Service's obligation to see that "no crops spoil in the fields for want of harvest labor." 2. Allyn Bainbridge, Farm Placement Representative for San Joaquin County, spoke for approximately ten minutes. He agreed with Mr. Roth's judgment that for all practical purposes, the county's tomato crop would be harvest by braceros as it has been for the past four or five years. He said, "We all know the union is operating here in Stockton, and I want to assure you that the Farm Placement Service is strictly neutral. We are neither union nor non-union." He dwelt at some length on a regulation which he said his office will be enforcing for the first time this year: namely, the requirement that Mexican Nationals be kept working approximately 40 hours a week. If they fall below this figure, he said, in accordance with Mr. Carr's recent directives, the Farm Placement Service will have to "consider the possibility that Nationals have been over-certified." He said, "It's up to you. We have no idea whether you need a man for every acre and a half, every two acres, or every two and a half acres. All we can do is take your word for it. So get out in the field, and see how your men are actually doing. Don't do the way some of you have been doing in the past: going to your labor contractor or labor camp operator and asking him, 'How many men will I need this year?' If you give them the responsibility this way, they'll overestimate the number more likely than not." (Ed. note: it is very important to observe the easy manner in which everyone connected with the bracero program accepts the fact labor contractors are running the Nationals -- even though this is directly contrary to law.) 3. William Duarte, Secretary-Manager of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association was called upon to speak next. He began by reporting on a conference

step in. They claimed that California was shipping contaminated foodstuffs around the country."

Mr. Duarte then echoed Mr. Bainbridge's remarks concerning the importance of keeping Nationals busy. There was a question from the floor regarding the problem of keepin g Nationals busy between pickings. Mr. Duarte said, "That's something for you to work out with whoever is running your National camp."

Mr. Duarte then told of the troubles he had been having with Nationals already this season. There was a strike of 200 or 300 tomato pickers in Merced County earlier in the day, which Mr. Duarte said he had settled with the assistance of Mr. Edward Hayes.

4. The meeting was then thrown open to a discussion of this season's tomato picking rate. The chairman (I didn't get his name) stated, "We aren't going to have any formal motion, and we aren't going to take a vote, because we don't set the rate. We just recommend a rate." In the informal discussion which followed, it was agreed that the rate should not be higher than 12¢ for first picking. There was considerable discussion of the procedure to be followed on second and third picking. It was the general consensus of the group that a "sliding scale" was preferable to fixed increases for later pickings. One highly vocal member of the group said, "There've been many times when my crews have been able to do better on second picking than they did on first. But they've got it in their minds that they ought to have an automatic two cents a box more, come hell or high water. I've had sit-down strikes of Nationals who were averaging 70 or 80 boxes a day, because they had been told by somebody or other that the rate on second picking would be 14¢." The question was then raised at to whether one could pay less than 12¢. Mr. Bainbridge replied, "The law says the opening price for Nationals can't be lower than it was last year. You can pay domestics anything you want: 11ϕ , 10ϕ , 9ϕ . Of course, I'm not saying you can getthem for that. And if you've been paying your domestics less than 12¢ a box, don't come to me and ask for Nationals, because I can't give them to you." Someone then asked about the rules governing National crews' average earnings. Mr. Bainbridge said, "Your Nationals have to average 90¢ to \$1.00 an hour. That's a crew average. Naturally, there'll be individuals who will go below that. If you have a crew which doesn't make that average at the 12¢ rate, you will have to adjust your rate. We've been given instructions to audit your books this season, so keep your noses clean." Someone asked from the floor, "What if we get an all-lazy crew?" Mr. Bainbridge asked, in return, "Have you ever had an all-lazy crew?" The grower in question replied that he had not. Another grower then rose and said, "Two years ago, I had a crew of Nationals, and none of them would work a lick." Mr. Duarte asked him, "Well, did you have any trouble with them? Did they ask for the 90¢ an hour?" The grower said, "No." Mr. Duarte then asked, "Did you get your crop harvested on schedule?" The grower said, "Yes. I brought in another crew to work alongside of the first crew." Mr. Duarte said, "There you are. What are you complaining about?" Mr. Duarte then launched into a lengthy discussion of the necessity to hold the line on the 12¢ rate. He said, in part, "We all know what happened last year. We were set up for an ll¢ rate. We could have held it through the season, with the labor contractors that we've been working with for years, who know what the score is. But one or two fly-by-night contractors came in and upset the apple cart. They couldn't get workers because they were new in the area, so they thought they'd attract workers by offering 12¢. Pretty soon in got around, and the rate was raised to 12¢ on all of us. Keep on top of the situation so the same thing doesn't happen to us this year." 5. Negotiations between the Tomato Growers Association and the Canners Association were discussed. In the final meeting between representatives of the two organizations, the growers' association agreed to the price

-4set by the canners' association from the very beginning of the negotiations: \$21.50 per ton. Reactions from the audience were mixed. One growershouted, "What's the use of having an Association, anyway?" Another asked, "Why did we ask for \$23.75, when we knew damn well we weren't going to get it? Why didn't we start out by asking for \$22.50, and sticking by it?" Still another said, "I'll believe that \$21.50 when I get it on my own piece of paper. Hell, I'd be happy to sell my tomatoes for \$20 a ton right now." Alan Jensen, xxxx Executive Secretary of the Association, said, "You sign for \$20 and you'll have an injunction against you. All members' contracts have to be approved by the Association." The discussion went on for half an hour or more, without resolution. 6. There was a rather perfunctory discussion of the proposed tomato marketing order at the end of the meeting. The Association as such is supporting a marketing order which would reduce the California tonnage of canning tomatoes by about 10%. Individual members are free to support or oppose the proposal. Both sides were urged to attend the public hearing to be held in Sacramento on August 6. Some random observations: 1. The union was barely mentioned during the course of the meeting. Nor could I detect its mention in the general buzz which preceded and followed the meeting. Neither Mr. Roth nor Mr. Bainbridge made any mention whatsoever of the union's proposed tomato wage scale. I conclude that the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee is not taken seriously at this time by the tomato growers of San Joaquin County. 2. At no time in his discussion of the Farm Placement & Service's requirements, did Mr. Bainbridge give any indication that the Nationals! 90¢ per hour guarantee might apply equally to crews of domestics. I believe this is a point on which we can devastate the Farm Placement Service at a time of our choosing. It will be a simple matter to prove beyond shadow of a doubt that the Service has disregarded the provision of the law which states "reasonable efforts (shall be) made to attract domestic workers...at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers." To my knowledge, no crew of domestics working at piece rates in San Joaquin County -- or anywhere in California -- has/been guaranteed an hourly floor. 3. Approximately 50 growers attended the meeting. I dare say several hundred growers are engaged in the commercial production of tomatoes in the Northern half of San Joaquin County. It appears that a minority is making decisions in the name of the majority. This minority seems to be composed of the most intransigent types of growers. It would be worth our while to try to ascertain whether the silent majority, which does not attend Association meetings, is more amenable to reason than the vocal minority.